

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of February 12, 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yamada et al.* (US 7,102,282). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 recite a resonator structure which includes a first electrode and a second electrode where the first electrode and the second electrode of the light emitting device reflect 20% or less of incident outside light in resonant wavelengths.

This is clearly unlike *Yamada* which fails to disclose or even suggest a resonator structure which includes a first electrode and a second electrode, where the first electrode and the second electrode of the light emitting device reflect 20% or less of incident outside light in resonant wavelengths. Instead, *Yamada* discloses 10% of the light emitted from a light emitting device being reflected towards the light emitting device at the interface between a second electrode and the atmosphere. See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,282, Col. 10, l. 12-23; Fig. 13.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing a resonator structure which includes a first electrode and a second electrode where the first electrode and the second electrode of the light emitting device are effective to reflect 20% or less of incident outside light in resonant wavelengths, an image is produced with the same quality as a conventional high-contrast CRT. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0156405, Para [0040].

Therefore, because *Yamada* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 cannot stand. Because claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, they are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, 8 and 9.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000